



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,246	06/29/2006	Yasutaka Mine	89277.0071	4313
26021	7590	05/15/2007	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P. 1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS SUITE 1400 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067			HUYNH, HAI H	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3747		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/15/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/551,246	MINE, YASUTAKA
Examiner	Art Unit	
Hai H. Huynh	3747	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration..

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9-28-05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet **within the range of 50 to 150 words**. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 11-15, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Igarashi et al (5,564,387).

Igarashi et al teach an intake pressure detecting unit 13 for detecting an intake pressure of the intake path; a fuel supplying unit 8 for controlling a supply amount of a fuel supplied to the combustion chamber based on at least the intake pressure; and a controlling unit 20 for synchronizing a drive reference position for

driving to open or close the control valve 10 with a timing of detecting the intake pressure by the intake pressure detecting unit.

4. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takao et al (4,725,954).

Takao et al teach the fuel supplying unit increases a supply amount of the fuel by asynchronous injection when a pressure difference of the intake pressure before one cycle or more and a current one is equal to or larger than a threshold in accordance with an engine rotational speed of the internal combustion engine.

5. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al (4,858,136).

Tanaka et al teach the fuel supplying unit increases a supply amount of the fuel by asynchronous injection when a pressure difference of the intake pressure before one cycle or more and a current one is equal to or larger than a threshold in accordance with an engine rotational speed of the internal combustion engine.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 5, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igarashi et al (5,564,387) in view of Tanaka et al (4,858,136).

Igarashi et al teach the claimed limitations except for an asynchronous injection.

Tanaka et al teach an asynchronous injection. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the asynchronous injection on the speed control system of Igarashi et al as taught by Tanaka et al in order to improve the response of the engine.

8. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igarashi et al (5,564,387) in view of Kobayashi et al (JP 2002-122040).

Igarashi et al teach the claimed invention except for a stroke determining unit for determining a stroke of the internal combustion engine based on at least the intake pressure. Kobayashi et al teach a stroke determining unit based on the intake pressure signal. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the stroke determining unit on the system of Igarashi et al as taught by Kobayashi et al in order to reduce exhaust gas emissions.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai H. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4844. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Cronin can be reached on (571) 272-4536. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Hai H. Huynh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3747